

Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.

COMMITTEE MEETING
STATE OF CALIFORNIA
INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT BOARD
SUSTAINABILITY AND MARKET DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

JOE SERNA, JR., CALEPA BUILDING
1001 I STREET
2ND FLOOR
COASTAL HEARING ROOM
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 6, 2006

10:00 A.M.

TIFFANY C. KRAFT, CSR, RPR
CERTIFIED SHORTHAND REPORTER
LICENSE NUMBER 12277

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION (916) 362-2345

APPEARANCES

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Mr. Gary Petersen

Ms. Cheryl Peace

Ms. Pat Wiggins

BOARD MEMBER ALSO PRESENT

Ms. Margo Reid Brown

STAFF

Mr. Mark Leary, Executive Director

Ms. Julie Nauman, Chief Deputy Director

Ms. Debbie Balluch, Executive Assistant

Ms. Lisa Barry, Staff

Mr. Elliot Block, Staff Counsel

Ms. Judy Friedman, Branch Manager

Ms. Natalie Lee, Staff

Ms. Corky Mau, Supervisor, Recycling Business Development

Mr. John Smith, Acting Deputy Director

Mr. Steve Sorelle, Supervisor, Office of Local Assistance

Ms. Rachelle Stein, Manager, Reuse Assistance Grants
Section

Mr. Kevin Taylor, Supervisor, Business Resource Efficiency

Ms. Lorraine Van Kekerix, Acting Deputy Director

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION (916) 362-2345

Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.

iii

APPEARANCES CONTINUED

ALSO PRESENT

Mr. Alan Abbs, Tehama County Sanitary Landfill Agency

Mr. Frank Ferrell, Greater San Joaquin Valley Stockton
Chamber of Commerce

Mr. Evan Edgar, Calilifornia Refuse Removal Council

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION (916) 362-2345

INDEX

	PAGE
Roll Call And Declaration Of Quorum	1
Public Comment	1
A. Diversion, Planning And Local Assistance Deputy Director`s Report	4
B. Consideration Of The Five-Year Review Report Of The Regional Agency Integrated Waste Management Plan For The Tehama County Sanitary Landfill Regional Agency -- (September Board Item 13)	10
Motion	16
Vote	16
C. Consideration Of The Five-Year Review Report Of The Regional Agency Integrated Waste Management Plan For The Sierra County Regional Agency -- (September Board Item 14)	17
Motion	25
Vote	25
D. Consideration Of A Request To Change The Base Year To 2004 For The Previously Approved Source Reduction And Recycling Element For The City Of Roseville, Placer County -- (September Board Item 15)	26
Motion	27
Vote	27
E. Consideration Of The 2003/2004 Biennial Review Findings For The Source Reduction And Recycling Element And Household Hazardous Waste Element For The Following Jurisdictions (First of Four Items): Alameda: Alameda, Alameda-Unincorporated, Albany, Berkeley, Emeryville, Fremont, Newark, Piedmont, San Leandro, Union City; Alpine: Alpine-Unincorporated; Colusa: Colusa County Regional Agency; Contra Costa: Danville, Lafayette, Martinez, Moraga, Walnut Creek; El Dorado: Placerville; Fresno: Clovis, Fowler, Orange Cove, Reedley; Glenn: Glenn County Waste Management	27

PAGE

5. Regional Agency; Humboldt: Blue Lake, Humboldt-Unincorporated; Inyo: Inyo Regional Waste Management Agency; Kern: Shafter, Taft; Kings: Avenal, Kings Waste And Recycling Authority; Lake: Lakeport; Los Angeles: Bradbury, Burbank, Calabasas, Claremont, Cudahy, Diamond Bar, Glendale, Industry, Irwindale, La Mirada, Palos Verdes Estates, Rolling Hills, San Dimas, Santa Fe Springs, South El Monte, Westlake Village; Mendocino: Fort Bragg; Mono: Mono-Unincorporated; Monterey: Carmel-by-the-Sea, Del Rey Oaks, Gonzales, Greenfield, King City, Marina, Monterey, Pacific Grove, Salinas, Sand City; Napa: Napa-Unincorporated, Upper Valley Waste Management Agency; Orange: Costa Mesa, Cypress, Fountain Valley, Huntington Beach, La Palma, Placentia, Seal Beach, Villa Park, Westminster, Yorba Linda; Riverside: Hemet, La Quinta; Sacramento: Isleton, Sacramento County/City Of Citrus Heights Regional Agency; San Diego: Coronado, Del Mar, Encinitas, Escondido, National City, Poway, Solana Beach; San Joaquin: San Joaquin-Unincorporated; San Mateo: Belmont, Burlingame, East Palo Alto, Menlo Park, Millbrae, Woodside; Santa Barbara: Solvang; Santa Clara: Cupertino, Gilroy, Los Altos, Los Altos Hills, Los Gatos, Monte Sereno, Morgan Hill, Palo Alto, San Jose, Santa Clara, Santa Clara-Unincorporated, Saratoga, Sunnyvale; Santa Cruz: Scotts Valley; Shasta: Shasta County Waste Management Agency; Solano: Benicia, Dixon, Suisun City, Vacaville; Trinity: Trinity-Unincorporated, Ventura: San Buenaventura -- (September Board Item 16)

Motion 43
Vote 43

F. Consideration Of The 2003/2004 Biennial Review Findings For The Source Reduction And Recycling Element And Household Hazardous Waste Element For The Following Jurisdictions (Second of Four Items): Alameda: Livermore, Oakland; Butte: Chico; Contra Costa: Concord, Pittsburg, San Ramon; Fresno: Kingsburg; Kern: Bakersfield, Kern-Unincorporated; Los Angeles: Carson, Covina, Culver City, El Segundo, Lakewood, Long Beach,

27

INDEX CONTINUED

	PAGE
Malibu, Montebello, Pico Rivera, Rolling Hills Estates, San Fernando, Santa Monica, Signal Hill, Temple City, Vernon, West Covina; Madera: Chowchilla; Marin: Marin County Hazardous And Solid Waste Management Authority; Nevada: Nevada City, Truckee; Orange: Anaheim, Brea, Fullerton, Garden Grove, Irvine, Lake Forest, Santa Ana; Placer: Colfax, Placer-Unincorporated; Riverside: Beaumont, Canyon Lake, Indian Wells, Indio, Norco, Palm Desert, Palm Springs, Perris, Riverside, Riverside-Unincorporated; San Bernardino: Chino Hills, Colton; San Diego: El Cajon; San Luis Obispo: San Luis Obispo County Integrated Waste Management Authority; Santa Clara: Milpitas; Santa Cruz: Santa Cruz, Santa Cruz-Unincorporated, Watsonville; Solano: Rio Vista; Stanislaus: Stanislaus County Regional Solid Waste Planning Agency; Tuolumne: Sonora, Tuolumne-Unincorporated; Yolo: West Sacramento, Winters, Yolo-Unincorporated -- (September Board Item 17)	
Motion	43
Vote	43
G. Consideration Of The 2003/2004 Biennial Review Findings For The Source Reduction And Recycling Element And Household Hazardous Waste Element For The Following Jurisdictions (Third of Four Items): Alameda: Pleasanton; Contra Costa: Clayton, Orinda; Fresno: Selma; Los Angeles: Avalon, La Canada Flintridge, La Habra Heights, La Puente, La Verne, Pasadena, Walnut, Whittier; Monterey: Monterey-Unincorporated; Sacramento: Galt; San Mateo: Portola Valley, Redwood City; Solano: Fairfield -- (September Board Item 18)	27
Motion	43
Vote	43

INDEX CONTINUED

	PAGE
H. Consideration Of The 2003/2004 Biennial Review Findings For The Source Reduction And Recycling Element And Household Hazardous Waste Element For The Following Jurisdictions (Fourth of Four Items): Fresno: Firebaugh; Humboldt: Arcata; Los Angeles: Alhambra, Arcadia, Bell Gardens, El Monte, Hawthorne, Huntington Park, Monrovia, Monterey Park, South Pasadena; Madera: Madera-Unincorporated; Orange: La Habra, Orange; Placer: Auburn, Lincoln, Rocklin; Riverside: Calimesa; San Diego: San Diego-Unincorporated; San Francisco: San Francisco; San Mateo: Brisbane; Shasta: Redding; Sonoma: Sonoma County Waste Management Agency -- (September Board Item 19)	27
Motion	43
Vote	43
I. Waste Prevention And Market Development Deputy Director`s Report	43
J. Consideration Of Awards For The Reuse Assistance Grants Program (Integrated Waste Management Account, FY 2006/07) -- (September Board Item 20)	48
Motion	57
Vote	58
K. Consideration Of Approval Of Allocation Proposal For Recycling Market Development Zone Administrator Training Workshops (Recycling Market Development Revolving Loan Subaccount, FY 2006/07) -- (September Board Item 21)	58
Motion	73
Vote	73
L. Adjournment	74
M. Reporter's Certificate	75

1 PROCEEDINGS

2 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Good morning, and welcome
3 to the Integrated Waste Management Board Sustainability
4 and Market Development Committee meeting.

5 As a courtesy, please put your cell phones in the
6 silent mode while you're in the meeting today.

7 Deb, could you please call the roll?

8 EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT BALLUCH: Peace?

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: Here.

10 EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT BALLUCH: Wiggins?

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER WIGGINS: Here.

12 EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT BALLUCH: Petersen?

13 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Here.

14 Are all the members of the Committee up to date
15 on their ex partes?

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: I'm up to date.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER WIGGINS: Yes.

18 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Is there anyone who wants
19 to address the Committee on anything that's not on the
20 agenda today? Why don't we do this? Would you -- why
21 don't you just come on up. Let's get it over with. There
22 you go.

23 MR. FERRELL: In and out like going to Wisconsin.

24 I'm Frank Ferrell, Public Policy Director with
25 Greater Stockton Chamber of Commerce. I promised you I'd

1 come up and give you a brief update on what the Green Team
2 San Joaquin is up to down in San Joaquin County. We've
3 had several meetings already. We're highlighting all the
4 alternative energies, all the recycling companies and
5 stuff. It's a big movement happening down in San Joaquin
6 County right now. But I'm here today to invite you to --

7 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Please.

8 MR. FERRELL: I only have a couple copies here.
9 To our REXPO III coming up in January as part of our 31st
10 annual ag Expo down in San Joaquin Fairgrounds January
11 16th, 17th, and 18th. We're going to be highlighting
12 about 150 different recycled content manufacturers and
13 alternative energies in fuels, et cetera, and so forth.
14 We have some workshops this year. And just want to make
15 you aware of it and love to have the Integrated Waste
16 Management Board as a partner in this year's show.

17 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: That would be great. How
18 many companies?

19 MR. FERRELL: About 150.

20 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: All recycled content
21 companies doing all kinds of -- that's wonderful. Very
22 good stuff.

23 And everything is going okay in the San Joaquin
24 area down there; right?

25 MR. FERRELL: Yeah. We're moving. We're moving

1 mountains in the valley.

2 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Thank you.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: Is this REXPO going to
4 be bigger than last years?

5 MR. FERRELL: Yes, ma'am. We partnered with the
6 League of California Cities to get it out to all the
7 municipalities this year to come. We've catered our
8 workshops to, you know, how do you turn city hall green
9 basically and how you make it easier for businesses which
10 I represent to go solar, to put together recycling
11 programs, and to purchase recycled content products, et
12 cetera, and so forth.

13 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Question, since you
14 mention sustainability and building green. In your local
15 building codes, is anything working through the system to
16 help stimulate the marketplace with the building codes?

17 MR. FERRELL: We're trying to stimulate our
18 public sector friends all the time, sir. So that's part
19 of the Green Team San Joaquin. For example, with our
20 solar initiatives statewide, we're finding that some
21 jurisdictions they don't have the capacity or the
22 infrastructure to have the permits made easy if you will
23 for folks that would like to go solar in their homes and
24 also businesses. So there's a disconnect. So those are
25 the kind of issues we look at through the Green Team San

1 Joaquin.

2 MR. FERRELL: That's great. Good for you guys.
3 Keep up the good work.

4 MR. FERRELL: Thank you. I'd like to have you
5 come down any time. I'll put you on my e-mail
6 distribution list for the meetings.

7 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Thank you very much.

8 Okay. There are also speaker request slips at
9 the back of the room. And please fill one out and what
10 you'd like to address in the Committee this morning and
11 get it up to Deb.

12 And I guess we're ready to go here. Okay.
13 Lorraine, you're up.

14 ACTING DEPUTY DIRECTOR VAN KEKERIX: Good
15 morning. My name is Lorraine Van Kekerix, and I'm the
16 Acting Deputy Director for Diversion, Planning and Local
17 Assistance Division. I have the Deputy Director's report
18 for you this morning. And I have a number of items to
19 report to you on.

20 The first is regarding Disposal Reporting System
21 data. The first quarter of 2006 reporting system reports
22 were due from counties and regional agencies on July 15th
23 of 2006. This is the first time we will be getting
24 information on all of the new elements that are required
25 under the revised disposal reporting system regulations.

1 Those are the regulations that went into effect on January
2 1st of 2006. Some of the things that we're asking them to
3 do that haven't been done before are things like matching
4 the tons disposed at the landfill to the tons that they
5 report to BOE. That's been a big workload for our staff,
6 and we're asking people to do that now. We've clarified
7 that you report alternative intermediate cover separate
8 from alternative daily cover. And one of the other new
9 elements would be information such as the air space
10 utilization factor that's going to be used to calculate
11 landfill capacity information.

12 So since we have these new things coming in,
13 staff will be reviewing the submittals closely, and we
14 will be contacting counties and regional agencies that
15 have not provided all of the new data elements. A number
16 of the counties have already called us to ask for time
17 extensions in order to complete their necessary computer
18 system changes to gather all of this information and
19 submit it to us. So we don't think we're going to have a
20 complete set, but we also will be working with the
21 counties to get this data set up to what it needs to be to
22 meet the new requirements of the regs.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER WIGGINS: What does air space
24 have to do with landfill capacity?

25 ACTING DEPUTY DIRECTOR VAN KEKERIX: It's how

1 they use the space that they have. It's an air space
2 utilization factor. So they calculate the air space and
3 then how much of it they're using in order to figure out
4 capacity. And I would have to defer to the Permitting and
5 Enforcement staff for a more detailed explanation.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER WIGGINS: I get it.

7 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: That's good enough.
8 That's great.

9 ACTING DEPUTY DIRECTOR VAN KEKERIX: The other
10 thing is that staff in the Disposal Reporting System
11 Section have been processing revisions to the 2005 DRS
12 data. And this will represent some substantial changes
13 for some of the jurisdictions. There were a number of
14 errors that have been found, and we're being asked to
15 revise the data that's already been input.

16 And finally, the Disposal Reporting System
17 Section staff have been testing the electronic DRS
18 reporting system. Our Information Management Branch is
19 working diligently to attend to all of the details that
20 would make this system work before we can release it for
21 testing by various counties. So we've gone through
22 several iterations of internal testing. We have at least
23 one more round. And then we hope to get some of our
24 counties to do some tests for us. And that will make a
25 big difference in how quickly and how accurately we can

1 process data. So we're making good progress on all
2 fronts.

3 In terms of the electronic annual report for
4 2005, during September all jurisdictions will receive an
5 e-mail letter on the process and time line for submitting
6 2005 diversion program data via the electronic annual
7 reporting system. This is the first year that
8 jurisdictions will be required to report on diversion at
9 venues and events. Staff has developed a model venues and
10 effect report that jurisdictions may choose to provide to
11 the venues and events within their boundaries to help fill
12 out this information. We'll be releasing the Disposal
13 Reporting System data as soon as we can, but we have to
14 wait for all of the adjustment factors before the
15 jurisdictions can work on submitting their diversion
16 rates. So we'll be reporting back to you when we can do
17 that.

18 And the final item is an update on the California
19 Governor and First Lady's Conference on Women and
20 Families. Board staff have met with planners for the
21 California Governor and First Lady's Conference on Women
22 and Families and the operations staff of the Long Beach
23 Convention Center to discuss opportunities for greening
24 the conference which will be held on the 26th of
25 September. The concepts we've discussed were diversion in

1 the exhibit hall, composting all luncheon waste, and
2 improving public communication regarding waste diversion.
3 This year, there will be an emphasis placed on increasing
4 the role of Convention Center in implementing diversion
5 programs. The convention planners estimate that 11,500
6 lunches will be served, and they plan to use compostable
7 lunch boxes, cutlery, and other containers that may be
8 needed to serve items within the lunch box. And the next
9 meeting with the planners will be to review a sample of
10 the lunch and determine if there are any contaminants that
11 will prevent composting. It's a tough job, but somebody's
12 got to do it.

13 And that concludes my Deputy Director's report.

14 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: So if it doesn't chew
15 well, it's not compostable; right?

16 ACTING DEPUTY DIRECTOR VAN KEKERIX: Well, we
17 hadn't thought of that criteria, but we could.

18 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Thank you, Lorraine.

19 I'd like to recognize our Board Chair Margo Brown
20 who has just joined us. Good morning.

21 BOARD MEMBER BROWN: Morning.

22 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Okay. Go ahead.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: Lorraine, you mentioned
24 intermediate cover versus like alternative daily cover.
25 Can you tell me what the difference is between

1 intermediate cover and ADC?

2 ACTING DEPUTY DIRECTOR VAN KEKERIX: Well, the
3 daily cover is put on the working face at the end of every
4 working day. And intermediate cover we'd have to again
5 defer to P&E staff for specifics. But it's put over areas
6 that are not going to be worked for a while and they won't
7 be back there. It's not final cover. But when they move
8 on to work on a new area, then they have to cover it with
9 this intermediate cover.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: Is there a separate
11 category then for the beneficial reuse like for the road
12 base? Is that a separate category?

13 ACTING DEPUTY DIRECTOR VAN KEKERIX: Yes. That's
14 a separate category. And we're also getting information
15 on beneficial reuse under these new regs. But we're
16 working with people to make sure they're reporting it
17 accurately.

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: Once you get it reported
19 accurately, is staff looking at that to make sure that
20 they're not using an exorbitant amount of ADC or
21 beneficial use materials?

22 ACTING DEPUTY DIRECTOR VAN KEKERIX: The Disposal
23 Reporting System staff and the Permitting and Enforcement
24 staff work together closely on that. And we have an
25 ongoing activity to review the amounts and types of

1 materials used in the landfill. So we will continue with
2 those activities and add to them with the additional
3 information on AIC, the intermediate cover, and the
4 beneficial reuse.

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: Thank you.

6 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Any other questions?

7 Okay. I guess we're off to Item 13, Lorraine.

8 ACTING DEPUTY DIRECTOR VAN KEKERIX: Okay.

9 Committee Item B is Consideration of the Five-Year Review
10 Report of the Regional Agency Integrated Waste Management
11 Plan for the Tehama County Sanitary Landfill Regional
12 Agency. And Carolyn Sullivan is presenting this item.

13 MS. SULLIVAN: Good morning, Committee members.

14 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Good morning.

15 MS. SULLIVAN: Every county and regional agency
16 is required to review its Countywide or Regional Agency
17 Integrated Waste Management Plan every five years to
18 determine if any revisions are necessary.

19 The Tehama County Sanitary Landfill Regional
20 Agency completed the first five-year review of its
21 Regional Agency Integrated Waste Management Plan and
22 submitted the required report to the Board staff for
23 review. The Regional Agency has determined that a
24 revision to the plan is not necessary at this time.

25 Board staff has evaluated the Agency's review

1 report and determined the required elements have been
2 addressed. Therefore, it is staff's recommendation that
3 the Board approve the Tehama County Sanitary Landfill
4 Regional Agency's findings that a revision is not
5 necessary at this time.

6 Alan Abbs from the Agency is present to answer
7 any questions you might have.

8 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Great. Any questions?

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: Yeah, I have a general
10 question. Does it always take two and a half to three
11 years then to submit their five-year review to us even
12 when there is no revisions being made? I mean, is that
13 how long it takes to do one of these?

14 MS. SULLIVAN: Well, I've just personally seen a
15 wide range depending on -- I think with this particular
16 plan, it came in originally two years ago. And staff
17 reviewed the report and felt that there were a number of
18 items that were not properly addressed. So we sent it
19 back. And then after the LTF met and addressed those
20 concerns, they resubmitted it. So there was a lag time
21 from the original submittal to us.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: They just submitted
23 three years late. They've submitted it, and you've been
24 working on it going back and forth.

25 Now, it says in here that when preparing the

1 report that they need to have a statement as to whether
2 their programs are meeting their goals. And if not, what
3 measures are going to be enacted to ensure compliance.
4 I'm just wondering, what were those? Maybe Alan can
5 answer those. What were those in this case? Since when I
6 look through here, since 2000, I mean, your diversion rate
7 is going down, down, down. So can you tell me why it's
8 been going down and what measures you're going to try to
9 take to get it back up?

10 MR. ABBS: Yes, ma'am. I'm Alan Abbs.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: I recognize this goes to
12 2005, so maybe you're doing better in 2004 and 2005.

13 MR. ABBS: I'm the Solid Waste Director for the
14 Tehama County Sanitary Waste Landfill Agency.

15 And you're correct. In the first -- during the
16 first five-year time period, our diversion rate did go
17 down. However, as of the 2004 annual report, it's back up
18 46 percent. I'm positive it will be climbing higher when
19 the 2005 numbers come up.

20 And just to talk a little bit about some of the
21 programs that we've undertaken in Tehama County in the
22 last several years, this five-year review report doesn't
23 include the -- or did include -- but towards the end of
24 that five-year period we started up our material recycling
25 facility at the Tehama County Landfill. Also, near the

1 end of that five-year period and to present, we've also
2 through our contractor, Waste Connections of California,
3 we've become very aggressive with targeting construction
4 and demolition waste. The City of Red Bluff has enacted a
5 C&D ordinance. We have a self-haul pad where everyone
6 that comes to the landfill goes to the self-haul pad. We
7 recycle out the scrap metal, the wood waste, the plastics,
8 and paper. We've also enacted a -- started an alkaline
9 battery recycling program through our curbside haulers
10 where people can put their alkaline batteries in with
11 their recyclables which would come to the material
12 recovery facility to be pulled out. We also --

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: That seems to be working
14 well? That's what I've been saying with this universal
15 waste. If we could put our batteries in the blue
16 containers, that would make it so much easier. It seems
17 like you would collect more.

18 MR. ABBS: When the universal waste exemption
19 sunsetted in February, we asked permission from DTSC to
20 try this program where we would provide residents with
21 thick plastic bags which would be noticeable. They're
22 bright orange. They have all sorts of directions and
23 contact information on them. We provide them at retail
24 stores throughout Tehama County. People that purchase
25 batteries can pick up a battery bag to get rid of their

1 old batteries. They put their batteries in this heavy
2 plastic bag. They toss them in the recycling bin. They
3 come out to the landfill. Since we have a manual sort
4 MRF, we're able to look for these bright orange bags. And
5 we pull them out and set them in a bin for further
6 recycling. We kicked off the program about three weeks
7 ago, so they're just starting to come into the MRF now.
8 But it looks like the program is going to be successful.

9 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: You're doing it in
10 conjunction with Toxics?

11 MR. ABBS: Yes. We have approval from Toxics.
12 And we've also received numerous inquiries from other
13 jurisdictions about how the program is going, whether that
14 would be something that would be applicable to them as
15 well. Yes.

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER WIGGINS: What is the population
17 of Tehama County?

18 MR. ABBS: Right now the population is about
19 60,000 people. One of the challenges in Tehama County is
20 that since it is relatively close to -- it's within
21 three-and-a-half hours of the Bay Area, two hours of
22 Sacramento, we're starting to see a large influx of
23 retirees. We do have a Del Webb community that's in the
24 proposal process. That will be 4,000 homes. We also have
25 another retirement community which has been proposed right

1 next to Del Webb. That would be another 4,000 homes.
2 And so the population of Tehama County could change quite
3 drastically in the next couple years.

4 One thing that we have done as part of those
5 environmental review processes is gotten Del Webb to agree
6 to a large scale construction and demolition recycling
7 effort similar to what they've done down in the Lincoln
8 area.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER WIGGINS: So you have -- it's
10 mostly rural other than Red Bluff?

11 MR. ABBS: With Tehama County, I-5 runs right
12 through the center of the county. We have two major
13 cities: Red Bluff, which is about 15,000 people, and the
14 City of Corning, which is somewhere around 9,000, 10,000
15 people. And then there's the remainder of that 60,000 is
16 in that I-5 corridor within about 10 or 15 miles of I-5.
17 So when you get outside of that 10 or 15 mile range, it's
18 predominantly rural. We have the Ishi Wilderness area,
19 Tehama wildlife area, Lassen Park to the east, and the
20 Mendocinos and the Yolo Bolly wilderness to the west. But
21 pretty much the entire population is centered within 10 or
22 15 miles of I-5.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER WIGGINS: Thank you.

24 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: You mentioned one of your
25 jurisdictions is going to construction and demolition

1 debris ordinance. Is the county considering it?

2 MR. ABBS: The City of Red Bluff passed their
3 ordinance about three months ago. And I think it was
4 pretty significant because at the time the development
5 community in Tehama County was having some problems with
6 Red Bluff city staff. There was a big turnover in the
7 city. But despite that, I was able to work with the
8 business community in Tehama County and pass the ordinance
9 there in the city of Red Bluff. So now that one of them
10 is done, it shouldn't be too hard to adapt that to Tehama
11 County as well. That's one of the projects for this fall.

12 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Good for you.

13 Cheryl, any more?

14 Great. Any other questions?

15 Can we have a motion, please?

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: I'd like to move
17 Resolution Number 2006-149.

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER WIGGINS: Second.

19 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Deb, call the roll,
20 please?

21 EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT BALLUCH: Peace?

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: Aye.

23 EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT BALLUCH: Wiggins?

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER WIGGINS: Aye.

25 EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT BALLUCH: Petersen?

1 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Aye.

2 I guess this goes on consent. Thank you very
3 much. Appreciate it. Thank you, Carolyn.

4 Item C, Board Item 14.

5 ACTING DEPUTY DIRECTOR VAN KEKERIX: Agenda Item
6 C is Consideration of the Five-Year Review Report of the
7 Regional Agency Integrated Waste Management Plan for the
8 Sierra County Regional Agency. And Natalie Lee will be
9 making the presentation.

10 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Good morning, Natalie.

11 MS. LEE: Good morning. The Sierra County
12 Regional Agency has also completed the first five-year
13 review of its Regional Agency Integrated Waste Management
14 Plan and has submitted the required report to the Board
15 staff for review.

16 The Regional Agency has determined that a
17 revision to the plan is not necessary at this time. Board
18 staff has evaluated the Agency's review report and
19 determined that required elements have been addressed.
20 Therefore, it is staff's recommendation that the Board
21 approve the Sierra County Regional Agency's findings that
22 a revision is not necessary at this time.

23 Regional Agency staff were unable to attend
24 today. I will do my best to answer any questions. This
25 concludes my presentation.

1 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Thank you.

2 Questions?

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER WIGGINS: I just have a comment.

4 These five-year review plans are the most interesting
5 reviews I've ever read. And the demographics are really
6 interesting. I mean, Sierra County has a 4,000
7 population. I guess it wasn't them. It was the one
8 before. Their parcel fee was repealed by voter
9 initiative. Anyway, I just want to congratulate you on
10 this really good information. And these 4,000 population,
11 I mean, the fact they're able to do anything is a miracle.

12 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: I agree.

13 MS. LEE: I think they appreciate that.

14 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: I just have one question.
15 On the markets, when they sell the materials and how they
16 operate, they're getting -- I understand there's the
17 transportation cost. But the market price for the
18 materials should be the same across the board unless
19 they're not able to store large enough loads to ship semi
20 loads or whatever. Can you shed some light on that?

21 MS. LEE: I can share with you my experience
22 working with the county. They've had a number of
23 challenges in creating large enough volumes to even
24 attract transporters to come up to pick up materials.

25 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: That's scary.

1 MS. LEE: It can be for them, absolutely.
2 They're developing better markets and better
3 transportation for cardboard right now. That was a
4 material that they focused on in the last two years in
5 improving the recovery of cardboard. But as they improve
6 that recovery, they hit the challenge of winter
7 conditions. And their budgets, even though they are a
8 parcel fee county, their budget is extremely small. And
9 they could not cover all of their cardboard collection
10 areas.

11 Snow season would hit. And although they would
12 have another challenge of trying to keep materials in a
13 marketable condition, one of their other challenges is the
14 community, although it is very small, their income --
15 their average income is very low and their residents are
16 willing to keep their own recyclable materials. And when
17 they go in for regional shopping kinds of trips, it's
18 worth it to them to take those to buy-back centers. Often
19 those are in Reno is a typical market for them. So
20 they're losing materials to their own residents who just
21 want to keep them and store them for their own, even
22 though it's small, but financial gain.

23 So they don't operate their recycling operations
24 with the intent of even breaking even. They are providing
25 it as a service. And they are looking to try to identify

1 other markets. They are looking at C&D materials, but
2 they don't generate. Their growth is so small that
3 they're not finding very many cost effective markets.

4 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Very hard to do.

5 MS. LEE: Very hard for them. They have a
6 geographic challenge, a climate challenge.

7 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Right.

8 And any quick questions?

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: I realize that this
10 jurisdiction is small and have their challenges. But when
11 it says this five-year review is from '91 to 2003, that
12 looks like a twelve-year review, not a five-year review.
13 So why did it take so long? Are there any penalties or
14 anything for taking so long? Or do we let them take as
15 long as they want or --

16 MS. LEE: We definitely have had some
17 jurisdictions that have gone beyond deadline on completing
18 their five-year reviews. And in the case of Sierra
19 County, we have worked with them for about three years to
20 get this report completed. They have had delays in just
21 having a complete local task force which is a required
22 element of completing their review. And that was a
23 significant delay in this case.

24 And I may defer to Kat on some of this
25 information.

1 But there isn't a penalty for a late five-year
2 review report. And with the 2000 biennial review process
3 coming in the same time as many of the initial review
4 reports, we focused on bringing the 99-2000 information
5 into our databases and working on program development and
6 bringing their diversion rates and diversion programs in
7 line above finishing the five-year review reports.

8 Is there anything you would like me to add to
9 that?

10 It was a prioritization of workload in their case
11 as well as in ours. And similar to many of these
12 circumstances with smaller jurisdictions, there was a lot
13 of back and forth review of their information and helping
14 them to bring these review reports to completion which did
15 delay the process, as Carolyn mentioned, for Tehama.

16 We have worked with Legal staff to make sure that
17 although the data set is longer than a five-year period of
18 time, that we have a reasonable method from this point
19 on to keep them on track and to have valuable data, not
20 just a year or two of data. If we've gone twelve years in
21 this first cycle, but to make the subsequent reports of a
22 valuable period of time as well.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER WIGGINS: I would just like to
24 comment that with the population of 4,0000, this county is
25 really poor. Their unemployment went down 14 percent.

1 And probably the people that work for the Sierra County
2 Regional Agency wear tons of hats, lots of hats. So I
3 mean, I give them credit for doing anything, thank you.

4 MS. LEE: I will tell them. They will appreciate
5 that. They definitely have a resource challenge just in
6 staff.

7 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: It's huge. Any other
8 comments or questions?

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: Again, they're small. I
10 realize that. But when you look at this little chart and
11 it shows their diversion rate in 2002 was 32 percent and
12 now it's down to 16, was there something that happened in
13 that period? Some big thing in the county that happened
14 that caused that drastic? I think we should be concerned
15 about that, even though they're small.

16 MS. LEE: Definitely. There wasn't an event or
17 specific reason for a drop in activity within the county.
18 One of the challenges with jurisdictions with very small
19 disposal numbers and things of this nature is they're very
20 sensitive to very small changes. So although we couldn't
21 identify a particular activity, we are forecasting. We do
22 have a disposal increase because of just improvement in
23 recordkeeping coming in for this county. So a 100 ton
24 difference for this county is significant. That is
25 certain percentage points. I believe we're about 3,000

1 tons in waste generation. So 300 tons is 10 percent in
2 their diversion rate.

3 And it doesn't have to be even a single
4 construction project. We have checked. They have issued
5 a total of four construction permits in the last year.
6 And those were all small scale. So we aren't identifying
7 specific activities. We know there is a sensitivity
8 issue. We are considering doing a new base year because
9 we do feel the base year right now is 15 years old. And
10 just it may be to their benefit. We do have that
11 challenge of resources and being able to complete a new
12 base year. They do not have funds to hire a consultant to
13 help them. So it's a matter of working it into staff
14 time.

15 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Excuse me. Can we help
16 them do that?

17 BOARD MEMBER BROWN: That's my question, too.
18 Are there any IWMA funds or grants or anything that help
19 rural jurisdictions that need help to do a new base year?

20 ACTING DEPUTY DIRECTOR VAN KEKERIX: No. We do
21 not have funding available specifically to grant them to
22 do new base years. The staff in the Office of Local
23 Assistance do spend quite a bit of time helping the
24 jurisdictions out. And we have a lot of tools that we've
25 developed to make things as easy as possible so that

1 they're not required to hire consultants to do the work
2 for them. Though as Pat Wiggins was saying, they wear
3 many hats. And they ultimately might decide to hire a
4 consultant. But there are no provisions for grants or
5 moneys to be made available because we don't have
6 statutory authority for that.

7 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: We need to work on this a
8 little bit. Lorraine, we have staff that are experts in
9 this area that we can loan out to help technical
10 assistance in the street.

11 ACTING DEPUTY DIRECTOR VAN KEKERIX: They are
12 providing technical assistance. The OLA staff are
13 providing technical assistance to the jurisdictions.

14 BOARD MEMBER BROWN: She said they're doing it.
15 I think that maybe it's something we can talk about how we
16 might be able to give rural counties that are resource
17 challenged as far as human resources some added assistance
18 in calculating in some way. Because if it took them 15
19 years to do a five-year review, a new base line could take
20 well beyond how long we're going to be here.

21 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: We'll all be retired.

22 BOARD MEMBER BROWN: But I think with 4,000
23 people, what they've done even in 32, 16 percent is
24 amazing.

25 ACTING DEPUTY DIRECTOR VAN KEKERIX: Just a

1 little bit of historic information. Yes, this five-year
2 review may be covering a longer period, but the Countywide
3 Integrated Waste Management Plans that trigger when your
4 five-year reviews are done were not due to the Board until
5 1995 and '96. And actually Sierra County got theirs in
6 sometime in late '97. So that's the first time that we
7 even saw what their final plan was. So they got their
8 information in in late '97, so it's not quite like 15
9 years without the --

10 BOARD MEMBER BROWN: It's not really 91 to 2006.
11 It's a couple of years. And you've already said you've
12 been working with them for several years on just
13 fine-tuning their information.

14 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Okay. Do I hear a motion?

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: I'd like to move
16 Resolution 2006-150.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER WIGGINS: Second.

18 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Deb.

19 EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT BALLUCH: Peace?

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: Aye.

21 EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT BALLUCH: Wiggins?

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER WIGGINS: Aye.

23 EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT BALLUCH: Petersen?

24 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Aye.

25 And we'll put that on consent as well.

1 Thank you, Natalie.

2 Okay. Item D or Board Item 15.

3 ACTING DEPUTY DIRECTOR VAN KEKERIX: Item D is
4 Consideration of a Request to Change the Base Year to 2004
5 for the Previously Approved Source Reduction and Recycling
6 Element for the City of Roseville, Placer County. And
7 Marshalle Graham will be making this presentation.

8 MS. GRAHAM: Good morning, Committee members,
9 Board Chair.

10 The City of Roseville has requested to change its
11 base year to 2004. The City originally submitted a new
12 base year change request with a diversion rate of 58
13 percent. As a result of staff's verification findings,
14 staff is recommending that some of the diversion tonnage
15 be deleted, some of it modified to ensure
16 representativeness, and additional data diversion tonnage
17 added that was missed, leading to a net increase of 1
18 percent and a final new base year diversion rate of 59
19 percent.

20 The City has also submitted the necessary
21 documentation claiming biomass diversion credit in 2004
22 which would increase the City's 2004 diversion rate from
23 59 percent to 64 percent. Board staff has determined that
24 the information for the City's new base year is adequately
25 documented and that it meets the conditions for claiming

1 biomass diversion credit and is therefore recommending
2 Option 2 of the agenda item: Approve the City's base year
3 change with staff and/or Board suggested modifications as
4 well as its biomass diversion claim.

5 Present to answer any questions and representing
6 the City of Roseville is Michael Tilly with the city's
7 refuse utility manager environmental utilities department
8 and Becky Siren, the consultant that worked on this
9 project with the city.

10 That does conclude my presentation.

11 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Questions? This is great.

12 Do I have a motion?

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: Great job. I'd like to
14 move Resolution Number 2006-152.

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER WIGGINS: Second.

16 EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT BALLUCH: Peace?

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: Aye.

18 EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT BALLUCH: Wiggins?

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER WIGGINS: Aye.

20 EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT BALLUCH: Petersen?

21 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Aye.

22 And that also to consent.

23 Here we go. Next.

24 ACTING DEPUTY DIRECTOR VAN KEKERIX: Okay. I
25 have a few introductory comments before we get to Items E

1 through H of the Committee meeting. This month we are
2 starting the 2003/2004 biennial reviews. At least once
3 every two years, the Board must review the progress of
4 each jurisdiction and determine whether the jurisdiction
5 is implementing the diversion programs it has selected to
6 achieve the diversion requirements.

7 This month, the Board will be considering the
8 largest number of jurisdiction biennial reviews it has
9 ever considered at a single meeting. That's partly due to
10 the streamlined agenda item format that we have permission
11 to use. And also we'd like to let people know that the
12 streamlined attachments which provide information on both
13 diversion programs and diversion rates have reduced the
14 size of these four agenda items by about 1,000 pages.

15 The staff findings for all 213 jurisdictions in
16 four agenda items this month are that they have good
17 diversion programs and they have met the diversion
18 requirements. In the upcoming months, the Deputy
19 Director's report will include information on progress on
20 completing the 2003 and 2004 biennial reviews. The
21 biennial reviews require a lot of work, and that work
22 starts very early with the Waste Analysis Branch and
23 Information Branch staff consulting with Office of Local
24 Assistance to update the electronic annual report and do
25 preliminary calculations. Then basically OLA takes over,

1 and they do a lot of work reviewing and verifying the
2 information. They'll describe that for you briefly as
3 they present each item. Only one OLA staff will be making
4 the presentation, but many contributed to each of the
5 agenda items.

6 The staff that did the individual reviews are
7 here today if there are questions as well as some
8 jurisdiction representatives. I would like to thank all
9 of the Office of Local Assistance staff for all their hard
10 work in completing their biennial reviews. Bringing over
11 half the jurisdictions to the Board in a single month is a
12 big accomplishment. And Steve Sorelle will be presenting
13 the four items.

14 The first item is Item E, and that is
15 Consideration of the 2003/2004 Biennial Review Findings
16 for the Source Reduction and Recycling Element and
17 Household Hazardous Waste Element for the following
18 jurisdictions. And this is the first of four items.
19 Alameda: Alameda, Alameda-Unincorporated, Albany,
20 Berkeley, Emeryville, Fremont, Newark, Piedmont, San
21 Leandro, Union City; Alpine: Alpine-Unincorporated;
22 Colusa: Colusa County Regional Agency; Contra Costa:
23 Danville, Lafayette, Martinez, Moraga, Walnut Creek; El
24 Dorado: Placerville; Fresno: Clovis, Fowler, Orange Cove,
25 Reedley; Glenn: Glenn County Waste Management Regional

1 Agency; Humboldt: Blue Lake, Humboldt-Unincorporated;
2 Inyo: Inyo Regional Waste Management Agency; Kern:
3 Shafter, Taft; Kings: Avenal, Kings Waste and Recycling
4 Authority; Lake: Lakeport; Los Angeles: Bradbury, Burbank,
5 Calabasas, Claremont, Cudahy, Diamond Bar, Glendale,
6 Industry, Irwindale, La Mirada, Palos Verdes Estates,
7 Rolling Hills, San Dimas, Santa Fe Springs, South El
8 Monte, Westlake Village; Mendocino: Fort Bragg; Mono:
9 Mono-Unincorporated; Monterey: Carmel-by-the-Sea, Del Rey
10 Oaks, Gonzales, Greenfield, King City, Marina, Monterey,
11 Pacific Grove, Salinas, Sand City; Napa:
12 Napa-Unincorporated, Upper Valley Waste Management
13 Agency; Orange: Costa Mesa, Cypress, Fountain Valley,
14 Huntington Beach, La Palma, Placentia, Seal Beach, Villa
15 Park, Westminster, Yorba Linda; Riverside: Hemet, La
16 Quinta; Sacramento: Isleton, Sacramento County/City Of
17 Citrus Heights Regional Agency; San Diego: Coronado, Del
18 Mar, Encinitas, Escondido, National City, Poway, Solana
19 Beach; San Joaquin: San Joaquin-Unincorporated; San
20 Mateo: Belmont, Burlingame, East Palo Alto, Menlo Park,
21 Millbrae, Woodside; Santa Barbara: Solvang; Santa Clara:
22 Cupertino, Gilroy, Los Altos, Los Altos Hills, Los Gatos,
23 Monte Sereno, Morgan Hill, Palo Alto, San Jose, Santa
24 Clara, Santa Clara-Unincorporated, Saratoga, Sunnyvale;
25 Santa Cruz: Scotts Valley; Shasta: Shasta County Waste

1 Management Agency; Solano: Benicia, Dixon, Suisun City,
2 Vacaville; Trinity: Trinity-Unincorporated, Ventura: San
3 Buenaventura. And now Steve will make the presentation to
4 staff.

5 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Lorraine, you missed a
6 couple. Could you repeat this again, please?

7 (Laughter)

8 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: This is what it's like
9 doing them all at one time. This is great.

10 ACTING DEPUTY DIRECTOR VAN KEKERIX: Excuse me.
11 Steve wants to make all four presentations at one time. I
12 guess I can either read the titles for the next ones or --

13 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Elliot, can you help us
14 here?

15 STAFF COUNSEL BLOCK: It would be okay to just
16 refer to the titles as indicated in the printed agenda
17 items.

18 ACTING DEPUTY DIRECTOR VAN KEKERIX: We have done
19 it with reading them in the past, but we haven't had this
20 many before.

21 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Right. We're expediting.
22 Right.

23 ACTING DEPUTY DIRECTOR VAN KEKERIX: Okay. Fine.
24 Item 17 as listed in the agenda -- or excuse me. Item F
25 as listed in the agenda, Item G and Item H. And Steve

1 Sorelle will make the presentation on all four, all at
2 once.

3 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Okay. Great. Go Steve.

4 SUPERVISOR SORELLE: As Lorraine mentioned
5 earlier, I will be presenting all four biennial review
6 items in this one presentation.

7 Staff conducted their review of 213 jurisdictions
8 and found they had all met or surpassed the 50 percent
9 goal in 2004 or their specific Board-approved reduced
10 goal. Staff found they were also adequately implementing
11 source reduction, recycling, composting, and public
12 education and information programs as outlined in their
13 source reduction recycling elements, or SRREs, and
14 household hazardous waste elements.

15 The jurisdictions were divided in four groups for
16 agenda item purposes depending on whether or not they were
17 also claiming biomass or transformation diversion credit
18 and whether they had been granted an SB 1066 time
19 extension or alternative diversion rate that ended in 2003
20 or 2004.

21 The 111 jurisdictions in Agenda Item E were all
22 adequately implementing diversion programs in 2003 and
23 2004, but none claimed any biomass or transformation
24 diversion credit, nor had they been granted a time
25 extension or alternative diversion rate.

1 The 62 jurisdictions in Agenda Item F all claimed
2 up to 10 percent diversion credit for either biomass or
3 transformation and met the statutory conditions required
4 for such credit.

5 I would like to point out, however, that despite
6 numerous checks and cross checks for accuracy, one
7 jurisdictions, the City of Malibu, was mistakenly included
8 in this item. With a 49 percent diversion rate, they will
9 be presented for Board consideration in an October item
10 instead and have been deleted from this item as indicated
11 in the Revised Resolution.

12 The 17 jurisdictions in Agenda Item G have the
13 distinction of having also successfully implemented the
14 diversion programs selected in their respective time
15 extensions to meeting the 50 percent diversion goal.

16 The last group of 23 jurisdictions in Agenda Item
17 H have also successfully implemented programs selected in
18 their respective time extensions and are also claiming up
19 to 10 percent diversion credit for either biomass or
20 transformation and have met the criteria for doing so.

21 Before I conclude, I would like to point out that
22 there were a few typographical errors in Attachment 3 in
23 Items 17 and 19 that misidentify the transformation
24 facilities used by some of the jurisdictions. These
25 errors, however, do not effect the jurisdictions'

1 diversion rates. The attachments will be revised prior to
2 next week's Board meeting.

3 To conclude, as a result of staff's evaluations
4 of these jurisdictions' program implementation diversion
5 rates, Board staff is recommending approval of the 03-04
6 biennial review results for all jurisdictions in these
7 four items.

8 We are aware of three representatives present
9 today who are available to answer any questions. They
10 represent La Caada Flintridge, Calabasas, Bell Gardens,
11 Concord, Brisbane, and Gilroy. We've also had some
12 unexpected but welcomed visitors who we were unaware were
13 going to be here who are in the audience, and I don't know
14 who they are.

15 That concludes my presentation. Thank you.

16 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Very good, Steve.

17 Any questions?

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER WIGGINS: I would just like
19 to -- this is a huge job for staff. And I want to
20 congratulate you for getting all this done.

21 SUPERVISOR SORELLE: Thank you. It's a mammoth
22 project. We look forward to it every two years.

23 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: We have one speaker with
24 regard to Item E, Evan Edgar.

25 MR. EDGAR: Good morning, Board members. My name

1 is Evan Edgar, Edgar Associates, on behalf of the
2 California Refuse Removal Council.

3 Today is a big day, 213 jurisdictions out of 420.
4 About halfway there. And it's a good streamlined approach
5 with regards to having one agenda item with posting of the
6 programs and the diversion rates. But today what's
7 missing as part of the streamlined approach is
8 transparency of the tonnage. One thing that CRC has
9 always promoted as long as the program approach was a
10 tonnage approach. We don't really see that in the agenda
11 package.

12 But I did notice during the presentation that
13 Lorraine mentioned that annual reports are submitted
14 electronically. It would be great to have that type of
15 information posted, not in a binder as part of the agenda
16 item, but for all jurisdictions that do submit an annual
17 report, be nice to have those posted, the electronic
18 copies posted to have that transparency of balancing the
19 tonnages to the programs and then get a diversion rate.
20 Because so many times we see some types of programs that
21 are really good, but their tonnages may have been inflated
22 through different types of source reduction or high inert
23 numbers per se.

24 And it's always nice to see like today the city
25 of Roseville had 120,000 tons of inerts in one year.

1 That's great. But they can do that every year. That's a
2 good number, but that's 38 percent of the generation. So
3 many times it's nice to see that correlation between
4 programs and tons. And by posting the electronic annual
5 reports, it gives us an opportunity to do that. Thank
6 you.

7 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Good point. Good point.
8 We'll take that in consideration. If we can do that, it
9 would be a good idea.

10 ACTING DEPUTY DIRECTOR VAN KEKERIX: Yes. We can
11 take that under consideration. We have some upgrades of
12 our databases that are ongoing. And we do post all of the
13 information that comes out of the reviews, and that will
14 all be up on the Board meeting. But at this point in
15 time, we don't have public access to everything that's
16 filed with the electronic annual report. And we can look
17 at making more of it available.

18 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Great. Lorraine and
19 staff, Steve, everybody, thank you. Wow. This is a big
20 deal. Well done. You guys have been busy.

21 Anyway, do I have a motion?

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: I have a question. I'm
23 sorry. I do have questions.

24 On Agenda Item 16 where it lists in the back on
25 16a where it says the Public Resources Code allows the

1 Board to grant rural jurisdictions a reduction from the 50
2 percent diversion. And if certain conditions are met --
3 can you list those or fresh my memory on what those
4 conditions are that a rural jurisdiction has to meet in
5 order to get these reduced --

6 ACTING DEPUTY DIRECTOR VAN KEKERIX: There are a
7 number of conditions. The first one is it has to meet the
8 statutory definition of rural, which has to do with the
9 overall population and the density of population. And
10 then maybe --

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: And those are looked at
12 every biennial review, because as populations go up, then
13 maybe some of them aren't rural anymore?

14 ACTING DEPUTY DIRECTOR VAN KEKERIX: We look at
15 them every single year, not just the biennial reviews. We
16 notify people if they no longer meet the statutory
17 criteria for being rural.

18 And then it's whether they are in primary
19 metropolitan statistical area, distance from markets. And
20 I think those are the primary ones. Katherine may have
21 some additional info. No. Those are the primary criteria
22 they need to meet. And that despite all reasonable and
23 feasible efforts, they will have a problem achieving the
24 50 percent.

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: Then the Board approved

1 reduced diversion numbers. Like just say for the first
2 one, Alpine is 25 percent. But yet they're doing 44,
3 which is great. How did you get that 25 percent? Does
4 that ever change? Now that they're at 44 percent, do we
5 still say their Board approved diversion requirement is
6 still 25? Which does that ever --

7 MS. CARDOZA: When they took these all before the
8 Board -- and they came at different times. And Alpine
9 came to the Board in August of '95, and they proposed what
10 they thought would be feasible at the time. And that was
11 approved at the time for 25 percent. What we do, we have
12 rescinded some of the jurisdictions petition for
13 reduction. For example, King City and Monterey, we
14 rescinded that at one of the biennial reviews, because
15 they showed that consistently over the years that they
16 were above that what they thought would be the most
17 feasible. So we rescinded it, because they were able to
18 meet the 50 percent. Others, they go up and down so much
19 between the years, it's really hard to say which would be
20 the most feasible one year or the next.

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: So you're reevaluating
22 this Board approved reduced diversion requirement every
23 single couple of years?

24 MS. CARDOZA: Yeah. Every year we look at that.
25 Do they still meet the rural reduction -- the rural

1 definition. Are they consistently above or not. In fact,
2 there will be another jurisdiction coming forward in
3 November which will be rescinding -- proposing to rescind
4 their reduction because they've been consistently above.
5 And some have been rescinded because they've joined, say,
6 a regional agency. And so that falls out then of the
7 rural definition. So they do change. They're not just --
8 we don't just ignore them and they go on in the future.
9 We do look at them every year.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: We evaluate at them all
11 the time?

12 MS. CARDOZA: Right.

13 ACTING DEPUTY DIRECTOR VAN KEKERIX: But the ones
14 that are in here that still may have a low number in their
15 petition, they're the ones that their numbers are going up
16 and down every year. And we're never certain what the
17 next year will bring.

18 MS. CARDOZA: Again, because they're small -- as
19 Natalie had explained, because they're so small, they're
20 very sensitive to any minor changes. So one year
21 they're -- I think we had one that one year they were
22 100 percent diversion and the next year they're at 3. And
23 part of it is reporting, and one truck can make a huge
24 difference.

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: I guess what I'd like to

1 start considering -- and not just the rural counties, but
2 other counties and jurisdictions that can't get to
3 50 percent, there's good reasons they can't get to
4 50 percent. But what can they do to show they're making
5 that good faith effort? Do they have the C&D ordinance?
6 Are they using, you know, recycled oil in their city
7 trucks? Are they using compost and mulch? Are they using
8 retreaded tires? Are they using recyclable oil filters and
9 air filters and recycled paint on their city buildings?
10 This is a discussion I know the Board will have to
11 undertake.

12 But so we realize it's hard because of their
13 population or whatever that they can't get to 50 percent,
14 but there are other things I think we can look to start
15 looking at other things that they can do.

16 MS. CARDOZA: There are a couple things in
17 statute that are required. One is procurement policy,
18 that they do have that. There are a couple things in
19 statute. I do recall that one. I don't know if -- I
20 think there's maybe one other one they are required to
21 have at least. But otherwise, it's not prescriptive in
22 statute on what programs they have to have to qualify.

23 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: But as we get through this
24 with each of the jurisdictions, we're sharing information
25 and helping them along with the things they can -- and

1 other things they can possibly do; correct?

2 MS. CARDOZA: Right. And there's less than 20,
3 maybe even 15, jurisdictions that have this. And we're
4 not granting them any more for that reason, that they go
5 up and down so much. We go with a good faith effort. And
6 that's what we look at is mostly their programs.

7 ACTING DEPUTY DIRECTOR VAN KEKERIX: And just to
8 clarify, this month there are no jurisdictions that staff
9 is recommending be found to have made a good faith effort.
10 Those will be coming in future months.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: I have a question on
12 Item 18, 18-4. This is great that everyone is above the
13 50 percent. But I notice that four of the 17
14 jurisdictions, or 24 percent of the jurisdictions,
15 actually their diversion rates have gone down, even though
16 they're still above the 50 percent. I was wondering, is
17 this something staff has looked at? Are they concerned
18 about it at all?

19 MS. CARDOZA: Well, we do monitor that. And we
20 do -- when we send out our letters after the 120 day. We
21 have 120 day statutory review time for their annual
22 reports. If they do go down, we do alert the jurisdiction
23 that we have reviewed this and we want to make sure that
24 you're aware that it is going down. And we talked with
25 them to see if they're aware of what it could have been, a

1 particular event, something they can't deduct that from,
2 like say some -- not a disaster that they can deduct, but
3 something that happened out of the ordinary. But we do
4 look at that. It doesn't just go unnoticed.

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: Just on the face of it
6 looking at this you think, well, it looks good because
7 they're above 50 percent. But 24 percent of them are
8 dropping. I guess that kind of concerns me.

9 And the same thing with 19. There were several
10 there that were doing well, but they've gone way down. So
11 I guess, like I said, it seems -- I just don't want this
12 to be a trend where they go, we're way up here, but we
13 only have to be at 50 percent and now we're seeing things
14 go down.

15 MS. CARDOZA: And we look for trends, and they
16 can vary from year to year. They're estimates. So they
17 can change. But we do look for trends.

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: Okay. Thank you.

19 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Well, again, thank you,
20 guys. Great job.

21 Do I hear a motion, please?

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER WIGGINS: Yes. I would like to
23 move adoption of Resolutions 2006-153 and 2006-154 and
24 2006-155 and 2006-156.

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: I think we need to have

1 that be 154 revised because of Malibu.

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER WIGGINS: I move that Resolution
3 2006-154 Revised be adopted.

4 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Is there a second?

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: Second.

6 EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT BALLUCH: Peace?

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: Aye.

8 EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT BALLUCH: Wiggins?

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER WIGGINS: Aye.

10 EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT BALLUCH: Petersen?

11 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Aye.

12 Okay. That was great. I feel better. Okay. We
13 got J, Board Item 20.

14 BOARD MEMBER BROWN: Are we to going to put that
15 on consent, Mr. Chair?

16 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Yeah. We'll consent on
17 it.

18 There's John.

19 ACTING DEPUTY DIRECTOR SMITH: For the rest of
20 the agenda, I don't think I can be as efficient as
21 Lorraine. So bear with me.

22 Good morning, Chair Peterson, Committee Members
23 Peace and Wiggins, and Chair Brown. For the record, I'm
24 John Smith. I'm the Acting Deputy Director for Waste
25 Prevention and Market Development. I have a few items in

1 the Deputy Director's report.

2 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: John, could you speak
3 closer into the mike, please?

4 ACTING DEPUTY DIRECTOR SMITH: I will. I'd like
5 to formally introduce this morning Barbara VanGee as the
6 new Supervisor for the RMDZ Loan Program. Barbara is no
7 stranger to this Board, having previously worked as a loan
8 officer here and as an IWMS, integrated waste management
9 specialist, in the Green Building Program. Her
10 credentials include extensive private and public lending
11 experience, great familiarity with Board programs, prior
12 supervisory experience, and ability to work cooperatively
13 and effectively with our internal and external
14 stakeholders. So please join me in welcoming Barbara.

15 (Applause)

16 ACTING DEPUTY DIRECTOR SMITH: The Collaborative
17 for High Performance Schools Board of Directors approved
18 the 2006 edition of the CHPS criteria at its meeting
19 August 24th in San Diego. The 2006 criteria advance the
20 standard for design and construction of high performance
21 schools that are resource efficient, healthy, and
22 comfortable. The new criteria not only apply to the
23 design and construction of new schools, but also to modern
24 renovations and additions. The CHPS program has been
25 adopted by 14 school districts in California, and they

1 represent over 2 million K through 12 students. Students
2 will soon experience the health and environmental benefits
3 of the high performance schools.

4 CHPS is working with the Office of Public School
5 Instruction to use CHPS criteria as the basis for \$100
6 million supplemental funding for high performance schools
7 in a ballot scheduled for November.

8 The revised CHPS criteria resulted in a rigorous
9 consensus process that involved experts in all aspects of
10 high performance school design. The CIWMB was
11 instrumental in this effort, having its own Bill Orr as
12 chairing the CHPS Technical Committee that has direct
13 responsibility for developing and revising CHPS criteria.
14 Dana Papke of our Green Building staff chairs the
15 Materials Subcommittee, of which Clark Williams, also
16 Green Building staff, is also an active participant.

17 Changes for this 2006 criteria establish a
18 prerequisite of 50 percent requirement for C&D recycling,
19 adding an environmentally preferred products option,
20 revising the recycled content credits so they are more
21 easily implementable, and adding credits for schools as
22 learning tools to bridge the gap between the school
23 facilities and curriculum, such as an education and
24 environmental initiative the Board advocates.

25 E-Waste Program -- any questions so far on that?

1 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Just one. Who established
2 the base line of the 50 percent on the C&D recycling rate?
3 Where did that come from?

4 ACTING DEPUTY DIRECTOR SMITH: It's in the
5 standard -- before schools weren't given a C&D requirement
6 under CHPS. But the 2006 criteria added that in, so now
7 they must meet the 50 percent criteria for recycling.

8 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Anything to drive that as
9 far as higher rates because we know we can do better?

10 ACTING DEPUTY DIRECTOR SMITH: Certainly there
11 will probably be some that do better. But that's the
12 minimum. And previously it was not even included.

13 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Okay. Great.

14 ACTING DEPUTY DIRECTOR SMITH: So we've made
15 progress there. And hopefully that's a minimum.

16 An update on the E-Waste Program. As
17 participation in the Covered Electronic Waste Recycling
18 Program, staff are working to ensure that all applicable
19 rules and regulations are being followed and that the
20 integrity of the system is protected.

21 Program staff recently took disciplinary action
22 of revoking approvals from nearly two dozen collectors who
23 failed despite multiple contacts and outreach efforts to
24 submit required annual net cost reports. Program staff
25 also temporarily suspended a large recycler for

1 approximately three weeks after routine DTSC inspection
2 uncovered multiple environmental violations. The
3 recycler's approval status was restored once DTSC
4 determined that the identified violations had been
5 remedied. And the time from being cited and remedied
6 wasn't that long.

7 As Program staff worked with Department of
8 Finance to refine our fiduciary responsibilities, we are
9 continuing to recruit staff allocated through the 06-07
10 budget to bolster both claims of processing capabilities
11 and further develop fraud detection and prevention
12 efforts.

13 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: John, excuse me. Can you
14 tell me who the violator was and what the circumstances
15 was of what was going on?

16 ACTING DEPUTY DIRECTOR SMITH: I don't have that
17 with me, but I can get that for you.

18 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Would you get that to me,
19 please, and the other members of the Committee?

20 ACTING DEPUTY DIRECTOR SMITH: The recycler and
21 the collectors too?

22 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Yeah. I'd like to know as
23 we're going through shake down on this program, I'd like
24 to know what it was and who it was. Thank you.

25 ACTING DEPUTY DIRECTOR SMITH: We recently

1 conducted workshops on promoting procurement of compost
2 and mulch. The Board in partnership with Caltrans
3 sponsored workshops in Los Angeles on August 22nd and in
4 San Diego on August 24th with a goal of increasing
5 Caltrans' procurement of compost and mulch for roadside
6 applications.

7 The workshops introduced a new Caltrans compost
8 and mulch specifications to Caltrans' district designers,
9 landscape architects, biologists, and storm water quality
10 coordinators. Both of the two workshops were well
11 attended. There was over 55 in Los Angeles and 47 in San
12 Diego. Additional workshops will be held in Oakland on
13 the 26th and Fresno on September 28th and Sacramento on
14 October 11th. These efforts are expected to result in
15 increased use of compost and mulch by Caltrans and local
16 road departments for erosion control, filtration of storm
17 water runoff and other applications.

18 That concludes my report.

19 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Thank you, John. Well
20 done.

21 Any questions? I guess we're at J.

22 ACTING DEPUTY DIRECTOR SMITH: Yes. We are at J.

23 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Thank you, John, for the
24 report. Well done.

25 ACTING DEPUTY DIRECTOR SMITH: Thank you. It was

1 a long one.

2 The first item is Item J, Board Agenda Item 20.

3 The item is Consideration of Awards for the Reuse

4 Assistance Grants from the Integrated Waste Management

5 Account, Fiscal Year 2006/2007. Rachelle Stein is here to

6 make the presentation.

7 REUSE ASSISTANCE GRANTS PROGRAM MANAGER STEIN:

8 Good morning, fellow Board members and Committee Chair.

9 My name is Rachelle Stein, and I manage the Reuse

10 Assistance Grants Program. Since the previous --

11 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Rachelle, could you move

12 your mike closer? Our sound system is not turned up I

13 don't think as it usually is.

14 REUSE ASSISTANCE GRANTS PROGRAM MANAGER STEIN:

15 Since the previous presentations have been rather brief,

16 would you like me to go through the full presentation or

17 just give the nuts and bolts?

18 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: When you're talking to me,

19 it's nuts and bolts.

20 REUSE ASSISTANCE GRANTS PROGRAM MANAGER STEIN:

21 How about if I just not go through the presentation unless

22 you guys have questions that are directly referred to the

23 slides, if that's okay?

24 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Fine with us.

25 REUSE ASSISTANCE GRANTS PROGRAM MANAGER STEIN:

1 All right. This agenda item requests the Board to
2 consider award of funding for the Reuse Assistance Grants
3 Program, Fiscal Year 2006 and 2007. And the Reuse
4 Assistance Grants Program was initially developed by the
5 Board in 1999 to support local government either in
6 developing or enhancing the infrastructure for reuse
7 efforts and an allocation of \$250,000 was decided by the
8 Board -- that \$250,000 would be devoted to this project
9 annually through the Integrated Waste Management Account.

10 The program specifically targets reuse or
11 recycling projects are not included as an eligible
12 project. And at this point, we've received nine -- we
13 have received nine applicants. Seven of those applicants
14 received passing scores. Five of those were from the
15 northern California counties, and two of those were from
16 southern California counties.

17 The total amount that was requested by these
18 applicants was \$352,000, and we're requesting the Board to
19 fund the maximum total of 250,000.

20 The applicants that received the passing score
21 were Sacramento Regional Solid Waste Authority, which
22 their program basically is collecting donated materials
23 through the surrounding region and providing those
24 materials to teachers to help with their units and lesson
25 plans.

1 The second is the San Luis Obispo Integrated
2 Waste Management --

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: Can I ask a question on
4 the Sacramento one? Was that \$50,000? From what I
5 understand, that's to pay the salary of the person that's
6 going to drive around and collect all that stuff.

7 REUSE ASSISTANCE GRANTS PROGRAM MANAGER STEIN: A
8 majority of that funding will be devoted to that person.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: If they don't get
10 funding next year, are they going to be able to do that?
11 Does the program go away? What is their plans for
12 continuing the project?

13 REUSE ASSISTANCE GRANTS PROGRAM MANAGER STEIN:
14 Actually, I was really impressed by the partnerships
15 they've developed. I've never seen a grantee have so many
16 partnerships already solidified. And they have the
17 McClellan park location. The site was donated, and it's
18 about 11,000 square feet.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: They figured it could
20 continue beyond this year?

21 REUSE ASSISTANCE GRANTS PROGRAM MANAGER STEIN:
22 I'm confident their program will be fully sustainable
23 whether we provide funding to them or not.

24 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: That's very interesting.

25 Lisa, you know the details on this; right?

1 MS. BARRY: I know I've worked a considerable
2 amount with this particular nonprofit organization.

3 Can I give the name?

4 The Resource Area For Teaching. We call it RAFT.

5 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: You need to identify
6 yourself for the court reporter.

7 MS. BARRY: Lisa Barry with the Recycling Market
8 Development Zone Program.

9 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Thank you.

10 MS. BARRY: I've been working closely with RAFT
11 for approximately the last six months prior to the
12 submission for a grant. They're originally out of the bay
13 area. And what they do is very, very interesting. And
14 it's phenomenal. They work with manufacturers, and they
15 take manufacturing discards, things that always end up in
16 the landfill, they find a home for the materials. And
17 they use those materials. They package them and sometimes
18 develop the educational curriculum that meets the state
19 standards. They take those materials and put them towards
20 science, math, and art.

21 The organization is strictly volunteer with a few
22 staff. And they do need to pay someone to drive the truck
23 initially. They're working diligently to get grants from
24 all the organizations: Wells Fargo, HP. And almost all
25 of the material is donated. So they're a huge diverter of

1 materials that none of our programs target. If you have
2 specific questions --

3 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: These are great community
4 based programs where everybody gets together within the
5 community to make things happen.

6 MS. BARRY: This is a phenomenal opportunity for
7 the Waste Board to partner and support this organization
8 coming to the Sacramento region. If you have any specific
9 questions or would like to take a tour of their grand
10 opening whether or not they get the grant, I'd be happy to
11 orchestrate that for you.

12 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Thank you. Cheryl. Okay.

13 REUSE ASSISTANCE GRANTS PROGRAM MANAGER STEIN:
14 The next applicant that received a passing score was San
15 Luis Obispo County Integrated Waste Management Authority.
16 And this applicant is basically establishing a reuse store
17 in the southern part of the county as they maximize their
18 efforts in the northern California. So they felt that was
19 a huge need for that community.

20 The third project is the City and County of
21 San Francisco. And they're focusing on construction and
22 demolition really on the forefront where they're working
23 with the folks who are actually on the foreground.
24 They're working with their C&D ordinance requirements in
25 moving that forward.

1 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Would you explain that a
2 little bit more?

3 REUSE ASSISTANCE GRANTS PROGRAM MANAGER STEIN:
4 Sure. Basically, the project provides outreach,
5 education, and technical assistance to those involved in
6 the construction and demolition trades.

7 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Okay. Great.

8 REUSE ASSISTANCE GRANTS PROGRAM MANAGER STEIN:
9 The next applicant is Marin County. And they're focusing
10 their project on creating and distributing and promoting a
11 reuse guidebook. They are utilizing various methods such
12 as TV ads, newspaper ads, billboards. They're focusing on
13 green businesses and targeting construction and demolition
14 businesses as well.

15 The City of Mountain View is doing a
16 community-wide garage sale. So most of the funding is
17 focused on advertising. And they have a lot of volunteers
18 and county staff that would be working diligently in
19 advertising program. It's been fairly successful in the
20 past, so they really want to increase the numbers of
21 people participating as well as the diversion.

22 Santa Barbara County is promoting C&D efforts.
23 They're in the midst of their C&D diversion programs, and
24 funding for this project would increase the diversion rate
25 from the county landfills focusing on advertisement of

1 reuse opportunities. They include an outreach campaign,
2 and they're also forming a partnership with businesses in
3 the construction industry. And they're also
4 incorporating -- part of their outreach program is to
5 really promote the San Bernardino County Max ads, which is
6 similar to our CalMax. So they're really utilizing that
7 as far as having that as a resource for the businesses and
8 the local community to utilize as well as promoting their
9 program.

10 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: You mean it's like a
11 materials exchange newsletter or something like that that
12 they're putting up or a website or what?

13 REUSE ASSISTANCE GRANTS PROGRAM MANAGER STEIN:
14 It's similar to the Waste Board's CalMax website, but it's
15 focused just on San Bernardino.

16 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: San Barbara or San
17 Bernardino?

18 REUSE ASSISTANCE GRANTS PROGRAM MANAGER STEIN:
19 San Bernardino.

20 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: I'm so confused. Okay.
21 Now I'm not confused.

22 REUSE ASSISTANCE GRANTS PROGRAM MANAGER STEIN:
23 And the last applicant is Monterey Regional District. And
24 this money would be towards a tent structure to be used at
25 their local mercantile area so they can protect the

1 materials that are coming in from the bad weather. And
2 Monterey is also receiving partial funding as we only had
3 \$250,000 to allocate, and they received the lowest ranking
4 score. So that's why there's a difference between funding
5 requested and funds recommended.

6 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: And Monterey is going to
7 do what?

8 REUSE ASSISTANCE GRANTS PROGRAM MANAGER STEIN:
9 They're purchasing and installing a tent structure to
10 extend from their current collection area for reuse
11 materials or what they gather from that landfill what they
12 sell back to the community.

13 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Okay.

14 REUSE ASSISTANCE GRANTS PROGRAM MANAGER STEIN:
15 So this agenda item is requesting the Board to consider
16 these rank of applicants as well as moving forward with
17 the grant agreements for this next year.

18 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Great. Are there any
19 questions or comments?

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER WIGGINS: On Mountain View,
21 they're getting \$9,000 for advertising. That's a lot of
22 money. They're going to do 18,000 all together.

23 REUSE ASSISTANCE GRANTS PROGRAM MANAGER STEIN:
24 Most of it is going towards advertising. They're
25 utilizing network ads that would cover 1.2 million

1 residents. They're having mailers, flier distribution,
2 large banner display over several artery roads.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER WIGGINS: Okay. We went from
4 4,000 in Sierra County to they have what?

5 REUSE ASSISTANCE GRANTS PROGRAM MANAGER STEIN:
6 1.2 million.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER WIGGINS: Well, never mind.

8 REUSE ASSISTANCE GRANTS PROGRAM MANAGER STEIN:
9 And some of the funding is going to staff resources and
10 just trying to promote it.

11 SUPERVISOR TAYLOR: Nine thousand is not a whole
12 lot for advertising these days. We stretched that out.

13 REUSE ASSISTANCE GRANTS PROGRAM MANAGER STEIN:
14 Any other questions?

15 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Can we clarify for the
16 record that if the funding does become available that
17 Monterey would get the entire amount?

18 REUSE ASSISTANCE GRANTS PROGRAM MANAGER STEIN:
19 That is correct. You are correct.

20 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Great.

21 Do I hear a motion?

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: I'd like to move
23 Resolution Number -- actually this says 2002, but I don't
24 think that's right.

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER WIGGINS: Second.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: Hold on. It should be
2 2006. Move 2006-151 Revised.

3 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Do we have a second?

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER WIGGINS: Second.

5 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Deb.

6 EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT BALLUCH: Peace?

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: Aye.

8 EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT BALLUCH: Wiggins?

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER WIGGINS: Aye.

10 EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT BALLUCH: Petersen?

11 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Aye.

12 Thank you very much.

13 ACTING DEPUTY DIRECTOR SMITH: Do you want this
14 on fiscal consent?

15 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Fiscal consent.

16 BRANCH MANAGER FRIEDMAN: Chair Petersen, if I
17 may, I'd like to announce this is Rachelle's first
18 presentation for the Board on the Reuse Program. She
19 previously had worked in the Office of Education. And you
20 may remember many years Sarah Weimer had been our reuse
21 grants coordinator, and now we are happy to have Rachelle
22 and doing a fine job in her place.

23 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Well done, Rachelle, thank
24 you.

25 (Applause)

1 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Next item.

2 ACTING DEPUTY DIRECTOR SMITH: Yes. Next item,
3 second item is Committee Item K and Board Agenda Item 21,
4 Consideration of Approval of Allocation Proposal for the
5 Recycling Market Development Zone Administrator Training
6 Workshops. Corky Mau will present the item.

7 (Thereupon an overhead presentation was
8 presented as follows.)

9 SUPERVISOR MAU: Good morning, Board Chair and
10 Committee members. Is this okay?

11 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Yeah. We're good.

12 SUPERVISOR MAU: This morning I'm here to present
13 this particular item, Agenda Item Number 21 on the Board
14 agenda.

15 --o0o--

16 SUPERVISOR MAU: We're going to be covering these
17 three items today.

18 --o0o--

19 SUPERVISOR MAU: First of all the need. We have
20 not had training services since October of 2005. And
21 continuing to provide new business tools and market
22 development tools is essential since our zone
23 administrators and our staff have a very diverse and broad
24 background. And I'll get into that a little bit later.
25 We also have an October 2006 workshop opportunity coming

1 up that I would love to have this contractor on board so
2 they can become more familiar with the RMDZ program and
3 the stakeholders.

4 The legislative goal for the program is to
5 establish markets for locally generated recyclables. That
6 is resuming this business and market development training
7 program for ZAs is just one method the Board can use to
8 achieve this goal.

9 --o0o--

10 SUPERVISOR MAU: So the solution to this need.
11 We are proposing that we enter into an interagency
12 agreement with California State University in Sacramento.
13 They would be doing three workshops per year. This is a
14 contract that would cover two fiscal years for a total of
15 six workshops not to exceed a total of \$175,000. And the
16 moneys would go for simply coordinating all the logistics
17 that you need to put on a workshop, coordinating the
18 facility, getting the attendees there, working with
19 speakers and things like that.

20 --o0o--

21 SUPERVISOR MAU: So why Sac State, I'll call it,
22 as we all commonly know it. Their proposed bid was lower
23 than another potential contractor who was interested in
24 the contract. So in essence, we're getting better value
25 for the services. And they're more cost effective.

1 What it comes down to is approximately \$87,000
2 for three workshops versus another bid that we had that
3 came in at \$100,000. Sac State has demonstrated
4 experience with the Board. They have conducted workshops
5 and conferences for the LEA Program, for the Used Oil
6 Program, and the Waste Tires.

7 And lastly, utilizing Sac State would make us in
8 compliance with Government Code 19130(b), which basically
9 requires all State agencies to contract with other State
10 entities if civil service employees can perform their
11 required services.

12 --o0o--

13 SUPERVISOR MAU: The fund source. The moneys
14 would be coming out of our subaccount, which is formally
15 called the Recycling Market Development Revolving Loan
16 Subaccount. And for purposes here, I'll just call it the
17 subaccount.

18 For this current fiscal year, you see the funds
19 we have available over \$800,000. This proposal would be
20 for \$175,000 and a remaining amount of over \$600,000.
21 It's important for you to also understand that in a
22 revolving account, any moneys that are not fully used from
23 this contract simply revert back into the account to be
24 used for ongoing contracts that we have or for loan, to
25 give out in loans.

1 --o0o--

2 SUPERVISOR MAU: Since the zone administrators
3 are diverse and represent our local sales force out in the
4 communities, many of them coming from either the economic
5 development industry or the public works recycling
6 industry, it's very important that our training segments
7 cover a diverse ground. Based on some surveys that we had
8 with them actually in 2004, we came up -- we looked at the
9 ten top highest needs that they had, and we came up with
10 six. And this slide and the next slide will go over not
11 in any particular priority but some of the highest needs,
12 if they had many of them, center around trying to find
13 loan applicants. They tend to cover the financial ground.
14 How to not only locate potential financial loan applicants
15 but also how to land the deal, how to use and implement
16 certain economic development strategies in their own
17 community that might meet their needs.

18 --o0o--

19 SUPERVISOR MAU: Designed outcomes. If some of
20 you might want to recall back to the white paper, we
21 included some program goals. One of our objectives was to
22 train at least two-thirds of our zone administrators by
23 the end of this year. We hoped to get that done which is
24 another reason why we'd like to get this contract up and
25 running and finalized quickly.

1 Some of the desired outcomes are indicated on the
2 screen for you.

3 --o0o--

4 SUPERVISOR MAU: And coming to a close here, this
5 allocation does support two of the Board's action plans as
6 well as the Governor's California Commission on jobs and
7 economic growth. One of the Governor's primary missions
8 with this particular organization is to retain businesses
9 in California and to help them to become more sustainable
10 to give them the resources for them to stay in the state
11 instead of moving out because of the different economic
12 challenges that the state has. And we support that too in
13 this program.

14 --o0o--

15 SUPERVISOR MAU: So lastly, our staff
16 recommendation is for the Board to approve Option 1, to
17 allocate \$175,000 for the subaccount for this contract, to
18 delegate authority to the Executive Director, and to adopt
19 Resolution 2006-168.

20 That concludes my presentation. And I do believe
21 we have a zone administrator here who wanted to speak on
22 behalf in support of this agenda item. And if you have
23 any questions, we'll be glad to answer them. Thank you.

24 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Questions?

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: Well, the partnership

1 you're going to make with the Business Alliance for Local
2 Living and Economics, are they only doing on -- just one
3 workshop? Are they getting in collaboration with all six
4 workshops that we're going to have?

5 SUPERVISOR MAU: At this point it looks like it's
6 just going to be the one. But we are trying to work on a
7 continuing relationship with them. And I think it's good
8 they are working on a special project in the central coast
9 RMDZ currently which is a long-term project. It's going
10 to go on for three years. So I don't see us doing just
11 one workshop. But right now we're focusing on a workshop
12 next month with them.

13 Some of you may have attended some of our
14 workshops in the past. We tend to have a format with
15 panel presenters. And depending on the subject, it would
16 be very reasonable to have a representative from Bali to
17 attend and participate in one of our panels in the future.

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER WIGGINS: Will this be in
19 Hollister?

20 SUPERVISOR MAU: Yes. The October 19th through
21 20th workshop will be in Hollister.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: Since you said
23 allocation supports our Markets Assessment Action Plan, do
24 any of the zone administrators, do you ever give them any
25 actual training in market assessment or in training in

1 waste stream analysis?

2 SUPERVISOR MAU: Yes.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: So that they know what's
4 in their waste stream so they know what businesses they
5 need to try to recruit.

6 SUPERVISOR MAU: Yes. That is critical. We know
7 that the program has some general parameters, and we have
8 some overarching goals for each zone. But depending on
9 whether a zone is rural or urban or depending on the
10 priority commodities or maybe a priority waste stream
11 problem they have in their location, it is very critical
12 that they understand what's going on locally as well as
13 regionally so they can customize their program to fit
14 their needs.

15 So yes, a lot of times in just the day-to-day
16 work that the staff does, not just the technical staff,
17 but also the loan officers, it's important for us to
18 understand various projects and what's going on and
19 whether or not a business really is going to have a market
20 for them to succeed.

21 So all of those things are looked at. And we try
22 to work very collaboratively with other programs, not only
23 from the Office of Local Assistance, but those --
24 sometimes we've consulted the analysts in the Waste
25 Analysis Branch so we can have facts and statistics to

1 help back up and support various projects that we enter
2 into with businesses in the zone.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: We gave an RMDZ loan not
4 too long ago to a plastic film recycler, and he was saying
5 in order to collect all the plastic film in the state, we
6 really need like ten of them statewide. So do we look at
7 through this program to see okay, if we want to collect
8 all the plastic film in the state, we need ten. Where
9 else does it make sense to try to encourage that type of
10 business in these different areas around the state?

11 ACTING DEPUTY DIRECTOR SMITH: We have an
12 additional two or three businesses interested in doing the
13 same thing we are closely working with. And one I think
14 just started up in Tulare as a pilot.

15 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Right. This is a growth
16 business right now. And it's local. We're self
17 controlling where we're going with all of this training
18 those residents here. I'm sorry. I know that you want to
19 speak.

20 MR. FERRELL: Frank Ferrell with the San Joaquin
21 County Recycling Market Development Zone Program. Thank
22 you very much for having me up here again.

23 Just to answer Board Member Peace's question, we
24 are at the chamber, we're basically a countywide. We know
25 no boundaries really in our programs. And as the zone

1 administrator, we kind of -- there's a nexus between the
2 opportunities through the Waste Board and our economic
3 development programs. We're now visiting industries on a
4 weekly basis. I visit three or four large industries
5 every single week in the country.

6 I'm trained by our partner, San Joaquin Solid
7 Waste Division and Integrated Waste Management Board to go
8 there and do kind of a preliminary waste audit if you
9 will. So I'm in there looking at what's going in the
10 trash. You know, then they kick me out. But I do a
11 preliminary waste audit, and then I refer to our
12 colleagues at the Solid Waste Departments and every
13 individual city to go in and do a full analysis if you
14 will. So I'm like the front guy, you know, when I'm out
15 there meeting with -- not only looking at that, but like
16 energy conservation issues, regulatory issues, and what
17 not, whatever is going to have that business prosper in
18 commerce in the name of our business.

19 So we've been able to provide a nexus if you
20 will. And we're the ombudsman for you. We're your voice
21 piece in San Joaquin County. And these ZA trainings are
22 essential, you know, to our success. Because it gives us
23 an opportunity to communicate directly with our other zone
24 administrators throughout the state of California and
25 share our best practices and techniques and whatnot. So

1 we're very eager and, you know, for the training. I think
2 it's a very good opportunity for us to share what we're
3 doing everywhere.

4 And Hollister is a hot spot. I'm going to go
5 there anyway. I want to participate in that and share
6 what we're doing in our county with our colleagues
7 throughout the state of California.

8 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Thank you, Frank. That's
9 great. Good stuff. You guys are superstars. I got that.
10 It's grand.

11 I have a question though. And Cheryl, I didn't
12 mean to cut you off. Corky, when the superstars like
13 we've got here in our zone administrators, do they sit and
14 walk through the process in the workshop what they're
15 doing and how they do that and the hustle they got?

16 SUPERVISOR MAU: Yes. Yes. It's always good. I
17 think a lot of -- while we may have some form
18 presentations and the format for training, presenting, I
19 think in surveys that we've had, really the most
20 beneficial piece of these training is the exchange, the
21 sharing from one zone administrator, a peer talking to
22 another peer and saying this is what's worked. This is
23 the problem I had. This is what we tried. This worked.
24 This didn't work. And you know, there's a lot of
25 comradery among them. And we found just having that

1 exchange has been the most beneficial piece of the
2 training for them.

3 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: The other thing is that do
4 we have a communications tool like between the
5 administrators that pops on and we do it online or
6 electronically that says I'm a recycling zone
7 administrator in San Diego, and I got a question about
8 this. Can someone help me? Someone from San Francisco
9 pops up. Is there is a way they're communicating like
10 that? Can they do that every day if necessary?

11 SUPERVISOR MAU: Yes. To answer your question,
12 the zone administrators have an association called the
13 CARMDZ, California Association of RMDZs. And they
14 themselves have selected their own Board members. They're
15 an organized group. And they have a list serve. That is
16 one way that they communicate all the time with each other
17 as well as we as the Board staff send out regular
18 communications and sometimes impromptu, just this is
19 happening or you know this particular loan in XYZ area got
20 approved. We try to do the kudos. We try to make them
21 aware of different efforts that are going on, different
22 grant solicitations offered by the Board or different
23 programs that are just starting up, we like to keep them
24 in the loop and aware of what's going on.

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: Corky, how many ZAs do

1 we have?

2 SUPERVISOR MAU: Currently, we have 33. There
3 are 33 zones now which is down from our 40 that we had a
4 couple of years ago. Many of them work with other
5 partners. That is, if they are in the solid waste
6 industry, we actually advocate and encourage them to work
7 very closely with their economic development counterpart,
8 for instance, in the county or in the city. And we
9 actually invite them to come to the training. So you
10 might almost double that if all of them came to the
11 training. We feel it's important for them to establish
12 partnerships private/public in their own locale and to
13 bring those people to the training too.

14 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Corky, are all the zone
15 administrators a member of the association?

16 SUPERVISOR MAU: It's my understanding that about
17 three quarters of them pay into it. There's an annual
18 dues. And I think my last -- I believe out of the 33,
19 approximately 28. So a good majority of them have joined.

20 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Okay.

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER WIGGINS: The zones pay dues?

22 SUPERVISOR MAU: Yes. To the association.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER WIGGINS: Oh, to the
24 association, not to us.

25 SUPERVISOR MAU: No. Not to us.

1 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: They could pay us. Should
2 they?

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER WIGGINS: Just a thought.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER WIGGINS: I think the market
5 development zones are a great idea and having the zone
6 administrators come together. I'm friends with Maurine
7 Hart, you know, and they really benefit from having these
8 workshops. So I really encourage this to happen and so
9 that they can have a workshop in October and get this
10 passed right away.

11 SUPERVISOR MAU: Thank you. We appreciate your
12 support.

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: Corky, in the Scope of
14 Work, it says the contractor will require all
15 subcontractors to use recycled content products. Since
16 the program's goal is to develop and promote recycling
17 businesses, how strict and how closely do you watch that,
18 I mean, and monitor that to make sure they really are
19 using 100 percent recycled paper and they're buying
20 everything that they possibly can buy for the conference
21 and for the workshops are made of recycled content? How
22 strict do you hold them to that and how do you monitor
23 that?

24 SUPERVISOR MAU: You know, this is the first --
25 for the RMDZ program actually this is the second time we

1 will have been using Sac State as the contractor. You
2 know, we will be having many discussions. I've already
3 had two preliminary discussions with them. They
4 understand our philosophy because they've worked with
5 other Board programs. I don't think it's going to be a
6 problem with them complying. But you know, we will have
7 those discussions with them. And you know, we notice.
8 We'll look at the paper. They have already -- since they
9 understand our philosophy about even reducing the amount
10 of paper, we will try to encourage more electronic means
11 of communication versus hard paper copy. But I have seen,
12 you know, some of the handouts that they have had, like at
13 the Tire Conference, the annual Tire Conference. And that
14 was done on 100 percent recycled content. So we will be
15 watching and observing what they do.

16 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Do we help like if you're
17 going to hold a workshop, that's lunch. All of that is
18 included in where we're going?

19 SUPERVISOR MAU: Yes. Yes.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: I guess the only other
21 question I have, I noticed in the funding information
22 there's \$840,000 available. And can you tell me what
23 other kinds of things are paid for out of this subaccount?

24 ACTING DEPUTY DIRECTOR SMITH: I'd be glad to.
25 There are a lot of mandatory services that are contracted

1 out with that money. For example, all the services to
2 foreclose on property, to secure equipment when the loan
3 goes bad. From time to time we've had funds dedicated to
4 outside legal services. We have funds dedicated to paying
5 the AG, to help us with our problem loans. To do credit
6 searches, we have special contracts with credit searches,
7 basically administering that program.

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: Some of these funds
9 really aren't discretionary? They're earmarked for those?

10 ACTING DEPUTY DIRECTOR SMITH: Some are somewhat
11 discretionary within the Loan Program.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: Okay. Thanks.

13 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Well, I have to tell you
14 I'm a big fan of what we're doing here in communicating,
15 getting the community dealing with what's going on in the
16 street. That's the only way this is going to happen
17 anyway.

18 Do I have any other questions? Do I have a
19 motion?

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: I'd like to move
21 Resolution 2006-168.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER WIGGINS: Second.

23 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Deb.

24 EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT BALLUCH: Peace?

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: Aye.

1 EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT BALLUCH: Wiggins?

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER WIGGINS: Aye.

3 EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT BALLUCH: Petersen?

4 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Aye. And you can get
5 started right away.

6 ACTING DEPUTY DIRECTOR SMITH: This is on fiscal
7 consent.

8 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: We are going to put this
9 on fiscal consent. And this does it for today's Committee
10 meeting. Thank you for coming. Okay.

11 (Thereupon the California Integrated Waste
12 Management Board, Sustainability and Market
13 Development Committee Adjourned at 11:43 a.m.)

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

2 I, TIFFANY C. KRAFT, a Certified Shorthand
3 Reporter of the State of California, and Registered
4 Professional Reporter, do hereby certify:

5 That I am a disinterested person herein; that the
6 foregoing hearing was reported in shorthand by me,
7 Tiffany C. Kraft, a Certified Shorthand Reporter of the
8 State of California, and thereafter transcribed into
9 typewriting.

10 I further certify that I am not of counsel or
11 attorney for any of the parties to said hearing nor in any
12 way interested in the outcome of said hearing.

13 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand
14 this 15th day September, 2006.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23 TIFFANY C. KRAFT, CSR, RPR

24 Certified Shorthand Reporter

25 License No. 12277